

TYSOE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Details included on the Parish website: Tysoe.org.uk

Secretary Isobel Watson, email nutmeg51@btinternet.com

Chairman David Roache, email djroache@buzzinternet.co.uk

Village Hall 7.15pm Thursday 29th November 2018

MINUTES

Present: David Roache (Chairman), Alison Mallalieu, Jeremy Rivers Fletcher, Isobel Watson, John Hunter, Cllr. John Tongue Members of public: 6

The Chairman **welcomed** members of the public to the meeting

Apologies – Malcolm Littlewood

Minutes of last meeting: Approved

Matters arising: none

Update on Draft Submission Plan

D.R. said that the Draft Plan is now heading to the Regulation 16 version which the committee hopes, optimistically, to complete by end December. Alongside the Draft will be a Consultation Statement explaining how residents have been engaged and how the committee has addressed questions and concerns from the public. Most of this Statement will be appendices of evidence such as minutes of meetings. Our consultant will prepare a 'Statement of Basic Conditions' outlining the Plan's technical compliance (e.g. to the latest iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework). D.R. estimated completion to be sometime in March 2019.

A.M. questioned whether we needed to go back to the early stages of the Plan in our Consultation Statement, but DR and others felt that this was essential. Jane Millward holds some of the paperwork from the early stages of the Plan.

Built up Area Boundary)

The District Council has questioned the Draft Plan's boundary for Middle and Upper Tysoe since it differs slightly from its own boundary. This is mainly because the Draft Plan's boundary is based on a larger scale map with more detail, but the committee was happy to go with the same boundary as the District Council.

D.R. suggested the possibility of redrawing part of the Lower Tysoe Boundary in response to public feedback. It is arguable that redrawing would fit better with the historical building line, but this is not clear cut and the committee will walk the boundary before making a final decision. The District Council suggested that the boundary should be drawn tighter in Lower Tysoe (it has been drawn round some large gardens reflecting the existing curtilage). The District Council also wanted consistency between the three Tysoes in the drawing of the boundary. This needs considering carefully as many gardens in Lower Tysoe are larger than in the rest of the village. Members of the committee will walk the boundary and finalise a decision ensuring that the justification of that decision is clear in the Draft Plan.

The District Council commented that the Strategic Gap looks rather wide (east to west). It largely follows field boundaries as recommended. The Council thought that the boundary could be justifiable in the Plan, so this is the first course of action. The justification will be presented to the Council for approval. Amending part of the Strategic Gap is also possible (north east corner).

Affordable Housing

Lack of affordable housing is a problem in the Draft Plan. Stratford has said that we can identify one of the sites for affordables. Site 3 is the only one large enough to do this. D.R. followed the District

Council's advice and approached Warwickshire Rural Housing Association who said they were interested in helping with this. Next, if the Parish Council approves, the landowner will be approached about this.

J.R.F. asked whether it was necessary for the Plan committee to get involved in delivering an affordable scheme. D.R. said that by taking this step they don't actually have to get involved in the whole scheme but getting affordables into the Plan is highly desirable.

This additional action makes the end of December deadline harder to achieve.

Reserve Sites

D.R. asked whether anyone had any concerns about the Reserve Sites after reading the feedback from the consultation. JRF said that he felt we had no option other than to proceed with them. A.M. commented that it would be good if Mark Henderson gave another presentation on the Roses Farm proposal. As a developer, Compton Estates has the interests of the village at heart. However, since this is only a reserve site it may well not be built. Compton Estates has no appetite to pursue the development as a Rural Exception site as this would involve the housing being almost entirely affordable and they would need it to give them a reasonable return on their investment.

Concerns about Herberts Farm being removed from the centre of the village are not justified, since the barns would be moved within the Centre and not removed.

It was agreed to continue with the Reserve Sites.

Community Orchard

Compton Estate gave feedback that they do not wish the Community Orchard to be allocated as a Green Space. Since the land is rented to the village as a goodwill gesture and, as things stand, the Estate has no intention of renegeing on this, it was agreed that it was better not to sour a good relationship by forcing them to legalise the arrangement.

Methodist Church

Public feedback commented that the Methodist church should have been designated a Community Asset. Although it is not used extensively, it does constitute a Community Asset and it will be added to the list in the Plan. This does not preclude it from other uses. The Methodist Church is currently selling off some of its assets and if it were sold off and became available it could be used for Affordable Housing.

Response Document

The committee spent a lot of time in producing an extensive Response to public feedback, but the District Council has advised against publishing this. Instead a one page resume of progress is being produced. Residents need to be made aware of this change of plan. The one pager will have a link to a 'read only' file containing the feedback from the consultation. IW to scan through the feedback to double check it has been fully redacted. A.M. to edit the one pager over the weekend. It will then be published on the website and placed on the Parish Noticeboard, in the shop etc.

Budget

Jane Millward has asked for the budget requirements to get the Plan through to completion. D.R estimates that two printings of the Plan will cost £3,800; the consultant a further £2000 and with a contingency of £700a total of £6,500 may be needed.

Public Participation

Question: Did Rosemary Williams at the District Council (who commented on the Draft Plan) have a flavour of the residents' comments?

Answer: She had the link to the public feedback, so yes she had full access.

Question: Why did she advise against a response document?

Answer: She said that any response document should only be factual e.g. 'what is a BUAB?'. In her e-mail she said that a Response Document such as had been produced would further antagonise certain elements of the community.

Verbally she told DR, in essence, that 'no matter how hard you try you will never answer all questions and concerns'. It also became clear to DR from the consultant that no village had previously attempted to respond to all feedback.

RW suggested that scarce resources are used in getting on with the Submission Plan.

The work done on the Response Document will not be wasted and will be useful for producing the Consultation Document.

Comment from Member of Public: The Parish Council needs to consider the Draft Plan and the support documentation at the same time in order to approve it. Also to remember that an election is coming up in May which will impact the timetable.

Question: Is the committee aware of appeals up-coming on Site 1 and on Home Holdings? Does the committee have any comment in relation to proposals in the Plan.

Answer: The committee has no comment. DR doesn't know if the Plan will have an affect on the response to the appeal.

AOB

DR to circulate possible dates of 2019 meetings to committee members.

Next Meeting: Tuesday 18th December 2018, 7.15pm in Village Hall

The meeting ended at 8.30pm